

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
3:04-cr-250

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
)
vs.)
)
)
JAQUES MAULICE DEGREE (6))
)
_____)

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court upon motion of the defendant pro se for a reduction of sentence based on the retroactive amendments to the United States Sentencing Guidelines relating to crack cocaine triggered by the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010. (Doc. No. 718).

The defendant originally faced a mandatory life sentence, but received a lesser sentence based on the government's departure motion. (Doc. No. 704). In determining whether the defendant is entitled to a further reduction under the amendments to the guidelines, the Court must calculate the guideline range as if the amendments had been in place at the time of sentencing. USSG §1B1.10(b)(1). If a statutory mandatory minimum exceeds the guideline range, the Court must use the statutorily required sentence as the starting point prior to considerations of departure. USSG §5G1.1(b); United States v. Pillow, 191 F.3d 403, 407 (4th Cir. 1999). No reduction in sentence is authorized under 18 U.S.C. § 3552(c)(2) when an amendment has no effect because a statutory mandatory minimum prevents lowering the guideline range. USSG §1B1.10, comment. (n.1(A)(ii)); United States v. Hood, 556 F.3d 226, 233 (4th Cir. 2009).

Here, even if the amendment provides a reduction in offense level under the otherwise applicable guideline, the resulting range remains trumped by the mandatory life sentence prior to considerations of departure. Therefore, the defendant is not entitled to relief.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the defendant's motion is **DENIED**.

The Clerk is directed to certify copies of this order to the defendant, the Community Defender, the United States Attorney, the United States Marshals Service, and the United States Probation Office.

Signed: March 5, 2012



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge